



PUBLIC SAFETY CITIZEN TASK FORCE PUBLIC MEETING

Tuesday, November 12, 2013

5:00 p.m.

Santa Cruz Civic Center Tony Hill Room
307 Church Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95060

MINUTES

I. Chair Reyes Call to Order

1. Meeting called to order at 5:15 p.m. by Chair Reyes.
2. Fifth meeting of the deliberative/legislative process.
3. Task Force members absent: Reyna Ruiz and Deb Tracy-Proulx

II. Approval of November 6, 2013 Minutes

1. November 6, 2013 Minutes are not approved. There has not been enough time for the TF to review them adequately.
2. The minutes shall be addressed in the next meeting.

III. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 14.3

1. This recommendation has been reintroduced because last time this was deliberated, many TF members were missing. The language has been reworked to be more succinct. This focuses especially on the mobile distribution of needles. Discarded needles are seen as a high priority of the community in terms of public safety.
2. Has there been any consideration in banning private, storefront needle exchange operations?
3. Yes, though that would possibly be more pertinent to a new or separate recommendation. Addressing pharmacy requirements and restrictions would also be important.
4. This was previously discussed and reworked to address the challenges with needle exchange. The needle exchange program is part of a County function and is their responsibility. It is unclear what the City can even do in banning the program.
5. Best practices towards needle exchange include an increase in supply of needles. Reconsider that language if the TF is trying to limit/ban needle exchange. It is difficult to comment on the mobile exchange.
6. The purpose of the needle exchange program is to decrease the spread of two diseases: AIDS and Hepatitis C. Best practices refer to disease reduction, not reduction in substance abuse or impacts on the surrounding community.
7. Those that run the needle exchange in the County focus on the health perspective. The TF should take a broader look at this issue. The best and most current research that could be found noted a limited impact that needle exchange programs had. The message this would send is strong.

8. In health terms, needle exchange affects the entire community. Injection drug users interact with other community members and can spread diseases to non-injection users. Health concerns are not just limited to the injection drug user community. Yes, there is an issue with inappropriately discarded needles and this needs to be addressed.
9. The message that this recommendation would send is not so much that the TF and the City are tough on substance abuse, but rather that they are tolerant to the spread of blood-borne pathogens. That is a horrible message to send.
10. The way that this recommendation is written, it will not have an impact on needle exchange. Needle exchange will continue in Santa Cruz. What this recommendation does is stop mobile distribution of needles by unlicensed volunteers. Needle exchange does need to be reformed. It is not limiting, or even intending to limit needle exchange. The goal is to stop mobile providers.
11. A statement needs to be made that mobile distribution needs to be stopped. Mobile distribution seems to enable rather than mitigate substance abuse issues.
12. Needle exchange's mobile distribution does operate under the jurisdiction of the County Health Department. Mobile distribution was occurring before it became a part of the County Health's responsibility. No one wants to find needles on the ground, and recommendation 14 addresses that. All recommendation 14.3 could do is potentially push needle exchange back underground. If this happens, there is no oversight or accountability.
13. Recommendation 14 took a realistic approach by addressing challenges proactively. The second bullet seems to follow the same intent as recommendation 14.3. They seem to say the same thing. What is 14 missing that 14.3 offers?
14. Recommendation 14.3 is asking for a specific deliverable. Recommendation 14 does not specifically address the mobile distribution of needles within the City limits. The City Council was able to get needle exchange out of the Beach Flats community.
15. There are 58 counties in California but only 37 needle exchange programs. What is the purpose of our recommendations to the City Council? Do not believe that the City is hard-pressed by the County to make laws. The TF is spared the burden of being completely responsible of the recommendations that will become law or policy. The TF is sending a message that goes to the Council, which goes to the community, etc. It seems more appropriate to send a more specific recommendation. Singling out the mobile distribution of needle exchange program seems more effective than watering down recommendations.
16. Are the TF and the City willing to accept an increase in blood-borne pathogens? The same number of injection-drug addicts are going to use injection-method substances the same number of times, regardless of the supply of clean needles or not.
17. Are there other needle exchanges in North County beside the Emeline Center?
18. No.
19. The Emeline Center is the only fixed needle exchange center in North County. It might seem like the Emeline Center is a draw for injection method substance users to come and stay due to an easy access to needles. Are there mobile units that go beyond the City?
20. Yes, mobile distribution delivers needles beyond the City limits.
21. How can this be addressed so the County takes more responsibilities for the issues that are within the County instead of focusing it within the City?
22. A call to question is made.

23. The motion fails with six no votes.

IV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 14

1. A motion to add the language "...by relocating the SSP to other County owned properties located in nonresidential areas, i.e. Soquel Ave. at Capitola Rd. Extension, 5400 Soquel Ave. or other location(s) deemed appropriate that minimize negative impacts to neighborhoods within the City limits of Santa Cruz. Syringes distributed will be identifiable by coding or colored marks as to identify them as being distributed by SC's Co SSP. Syringes will be exchanged on a one for one basis. An actual visual physical count will be conducted of syringes surrendered," after the term "neighborhoods" is made and seconded.
2. There seems to not be a true one to one exchange.
3. This is an amendment to recommendation 14. It is additive.
4. The coding on the needles can help answer whether or not the needle exchange is effective. Currently, there is no hard accountability for inventory.
5. Is this intending to remove the Emeline Center?
6. Yes, move the Emeline Center to a non-residential area, like in Watsonville.
7. What about the Center's proximity to Harbor High School?
8. The mental health facility is located closely, and there is no concern over its fallout. The City is looking at a population that is very fluid; they do not linger around the facility.
9. Tracking and coding needles are points that the advisory council is currently considering. There is no way that the Emeline Center can be relocated to a psychiatric health facility. That facility is built for specific purpose, not including needle exchange.
10. Do the individuals who receive needles under the mobile delivery system fall under the same qualifications that they do for Emeline? There are no additional health services. Mobile delivery services are severely limited on what they can do, where HAS can provide much more. If mobile delivery services are able to supply services other than needle exchange (treatment assistance, etc.) then there should be no problem performing needle exchange and services at another location other than Emeline, regardless if it is in a fixed location or a van. This is realistic and likely functional for those individuals who need further treatment than needle exchange will go to HSC.
11. Methadone users and users of the needle exchange program should not be at the same location. This is another reason why the needles should be moved to a different location. Consider a friendly amendment to remove the language regarding specific locations.
12. The friendly amendment is accepted.
13. The motion carries unanimously.

V. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 15

1. A motion to strike the recommendation is made and seconded.
2. The motion carries unanimously. The recommendation is struck.

VI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 33

1. A motion to approve the recommendation is made and seconded.
2. Would this recommendation provide any help?
3. Yes, increased police interaction and contact with citizens are helpful.
4. Consider adding language about where the officers should be patrolling on foot, bike, etc.

5. It seems useful to give SCPD directive. If the TF is going to recommend geographical locations, they should be data driven instead of limiting the options to specific neighborhoods. Recommendation 34 seems to specify certain types of areas. This recommendation should be left as is.
6. Insert the term “Recommend” at the beginning of the recommendation.
7. That friendly amendment is accepted, however, everything on the list is a recommendation. This is not necessary.
8. What percentage of SCPD resources is spent on foot/beat patrols?
9. Not sure on specific numbers, though patrols have decreased significantly due to restrictive financial reasons.
10. Include the language “...to high public nuisance areas...” to the end of the recommendation.
11. The friendly amendment is accepted.
12. The motion carries with two no votes.

VII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 34

1. A motion to approve the recommendation is made and seconded.
2. What is the definition of broken windows policing?
3. If there is a broken window and the owner replaces the window, it will decrease crime as a magnet. It shows that the surrounding community cares about itself.
4. Broken windows policing does not always target physical things, it also can focus on behaviors. For example, New York addresses illegal subway riding (like passengers bypassing the turnstiles). Cleaning up an area and its behaviors reduces all forms of crime.
5. A broken window, as well as similar surroundings, perpetuates a sense of a lack of the community’s motivation to combat criminal behavior. The recommendation’s specifics, “natural, commercial point of entry and focal point areas,” seem to distract from what the TF is trying to accomplish. What is being said here?
6. The broken windows strategy was seen to be highly responsible for the reduction of crime in New York City. A lot of natural areas within and around Santa Cruz are areas with very low law enforcement presence. This perpetuates a climate of anti-social behavior. It seems important that SCPD focus more enforcement on these areas.
7. A call to question is asked for.
8. There is an objection to the call for question.
9. In regards to law enforcement presence in natural areas, there is not actual law enforcement on patrol performing broken window policing. This is often done so through community service, or some other form of unarmed service. Does this recommendation still envision non-peace officers trying to enforce the broken windows policy?
10. The absolute details about how this is implemented will be the responsibility of SCPD. There needs to be a renewed emphasis on enforcement of nuisance crimes in natural and commercial areas.
11. If non-police officers conduct these patrols, will it be as effective in reducing criminal behavior as if a police officer were patrolling?
12. A friendly amendment with the language, “Recommend SCPD plays an emphasis on reducing these crimes throughout the City of Santa Cruz” is proposed.
13. This friendly amendment is not accepted. It would be if there was an emphasis on natural areas.
14. There is a park service in the City that conducts patrols like this.
15. What exactly are the points of entry into Santa Cruz?

16. The points of entry to Santa Cruz include all roads and other forms of entry into the City.
17. The motion carries with two no votes.

VIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 36

1. A motion to approve the recommendation is made and seconded.
2. Is there a bike license law? Is there a City ordinance requiring bikes to be licensed?
3. Yes.
4. There is a perception in Santa Cruz that people steal bikes on a regular basis without consequence. It is a crime that affects a large percentage of the community. If bike theft can be reduced, the connection between the community and SCPD will likely be improved with an increase in enthusiasm for law enforcement.
5. It seems that there is a public perception that SCPD does not do enough to prosecute bike theft. There are reasons why they do not prosecute as much as they could.
6. Is there a way to make it illegal to have a bike that is not licensed?
7. Yes. It is currently a municipal code violation if you do not have a licensed bike license.
8. The SCPD does not prosecute crimes, they arrest. The judicial system prosecutes.
9. This could absorb a lot of police time. A concern that there are so many infractions that they are not being enforced is expressed. If this recommendation is passed, a procedure needs to be implemented to make it easier to attain a bike license. At first, this seems like a very simple solution, however, this could be very complex.
10. Currently the City is making it as easy as possible to make getting a bike license easy and free.
11. After reflecting on this recommendation, consider stating that the TF does not know how the Council will implement it. However, take these recommendations seriously. For the sake of time and efficiency, do not worry about every single detail.
12. Consider changing the prioritization of this recommendation from high to medium priority.
13. That will be addressed later.
14. The City Council would appreciate some concrete solutions to more items. This is because the term best practices can be applied to every recommendation, however, that turns many of the recommendations into only symbolic gestures, and those will likely not succeed.
15. The best way the TF can approach this is during the prioritization phase.
16. A call to question has been made.
17. The motion carries with one no vote.

IX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 46

1. A motion to approve the recommendation is made and seconded.
2. Counties are responsible for social service, substance abuse programs, law enforcement, probation, etc. It seems that this recommendation is adding another group of people to try and solve these problems. It does not seem to be an efficient use of the City's time.
3. The recommendation's team could be very effective. It could help expedite impact quicker.

4. This recommendation addresses the 100 or so individuals in the City who are causing the 4,000 crimes. It is definitely affecting the City and is very important.
5. A concern over stacking groups and services on top of each other is expressed.
6. Where did the cost come from?
7. In regards to the concern over costs, some recommendations are more refined than others. As the TF refines the document, the staff will refine these numbers as well.
8. There is a legitimate concern over piling more services on top of each other. The issue is trying to hold those accountable that let their responsibilities slip through the cracks. On the surface, this appears as if the TF is trying to form another group to hold accountability to people who commit crimes. A concern over creating another department to do something other departments should be doing is expressed.
9. A call to question is made.
10. The motion carries with four no votes.

X. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 46.1

1. A motion to approve the recommendation is made and seconded.
2. Can someone cite non-judicial consequences for multiple failures to appear?
3. Cannot, but trust that the City staff can provide some examples with an appropriate amount of time.
4. What happens if an individual does not follow through on their non-judicial consequence? How is this enforced?
5. What is the incentive to appear to a non-judicial consequence?
6. From last conversation, an inability to use the library was a potential consequence for something like this. It is not that an individual must show up and perform a task; it is disallowing an individual from particular actions or entering certain places.
7. The motion fails.

XI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 50

1. A motion to approve the recommendation with an amendment is made and seconded.
2. The amendment includes "Rewrite the municipal code 6.90.040 to prohibit the cultivation of marijuana for medical purposes in residential properties in Santa Cruz City. Marijuana should be subject to the same zoning regulations as other agriculture."
3. If that recommendation fails, consider a recommendation with the following language: "In rental properties there should be a written permission from the landlord in the lease agreement to give permission for cultivation of marijuana for medical purposes in rental properties. If the clause is not included in a written lease agreement then the tenant shall be subject to eviction."
4. The second recommendation would substitute new language to state that it is no longer lawful to grow marijuana.
5. Does the first recommendation cover rental properties?
6. Yes, the two are separate recommendations in case the first one does not pass.
7. This recommendation is agreeable; it is very different from what other cities have done. Many other cities have outlawed outdoor cultivation while permitting some indoor cultivation.
8. There are two recommendations on growing marijuana. One is saying that cultivation of marijuana is illegal while the second states that you cannot grow

outdoors and there are some minimum guidelines for growing indoors. These guidelines are set by the state and growth has to be inspected.

9. Currently, there are two motions being discussed. Recommendation 50 is what is being addressed. This recommendation entails: "Rewrite the municipal code 6.90.0400 to prohibit the cultivation of marijuana for medical purposes in residential properties in Santa Cruz City. Marijuana should be subject to the same zoning regulations as other agriculture."
10. This seems to contradict state statute. How can the City formulate its own ordinance on regulating growing?
11. On such matters, the smaller sets of bodies of government can set more restrictive laws than larger bodies. In other words, this recommendation does not conflict with state law; it simply makes it more restrictive.
12. The City can likely become more restrictive. However, this could evolve into a lawsuit.
13. Is this something that the City Attorney's office could provide advice on for tomorrow night?
14. The TF must finish the recommendations tonight. The TF does not have time to table any recommendations.
15. A friendly amendment is made to include the language "...and modification..." after the language "Prohibit the cultivation of marijuana..." and "...any reason..." before "...medical purposes..."
16. Consider adding more direct terms, such as "processing."
17. Strike "medical purposes" and replace "modification" with "processing."
18. Recommendation 50 carries with one no vote.

XII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 50.1

1. A motion to approve this recommendation is made and seconded.
2. The motion includes the language, "Create and enforce code banning outdoor marijuana cultivation and restricting indoor cultivation to inspected grow rooms. In rental properties there should be a written permission from the landlord in the lease agreement to give permission for cultivation of marijuana for medical purposes in rental properties. If the clause is not included in a written lease agreement then the tenant shall be subject to eviction."
3. Consider a friendly amendment with the following language, "...not listed above in item 50..." after the language "In rental properties..."
4. The friendly amendment is accepted.
5. A friendly amendment is made to strike the language "...there should..." after "50" and replace with "shall." Also, include "/on said subject property..." and strike "rental properties," at the very end of the recommendation.
6. The term rental seems to be of concern here.
7. In light of what was just passed, consider the language, "If 50 is not possible, then..." should be added before the first sentence.
8. The friendly amendment is accepted.
9. Consider striking the rest of the language after "inspected grow rooms," to be struck and placed into recommendation 50.2.
10. A call to question is made.
11. The motion carries with two no votes.

XIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 50.2

1. A motion to approve the recommendation with the language, "In rental properties not listed above in item 50, there shall be a written permission from the landlord in the lease agreement to give permission for cultivation of marijuana for medical

purposes, in/on said property (Example CAR form LT section 10E. Property may be used for PPMC under 6.90.040) if the clause is not included in a written lease agreement then the tenant shall be subject to eviction,” is made and seconded.

2. A friendly amendment to strike “a” before “written permission” and include the language “to grow marijuana on the property,” after “landlord.” Delete all of the following language.
3. Include the terms “or process” after “to grow.”
4. These amendments are accepted.
5. A call to question is made.
6. The motion carries unanimously.

XIV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 52

1. A motion to approve the recommendation is made and seconded.
2. A friendly amendment is offered, in the second paragraph; add “storage” after “RV.”
3. This language is not very clear.
4. Another friendly amendment is made to include “RV/boat” to before “storage.”
5. This is accepted.
6. The first sentence seems to relate to public safety. How does the second sentence relate to public safety?
7. Dumping gray water in the streets and curbs is a public safety concern.
8. Also, many of these people utilize private water and electricity.
9. There is a difference between people visiting residences in their RVs and those who are not.
10. The motion carries unanimously.

XV. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 2.5

1. A motion to add a new recommendation with the language “Increase the number of school resource officers to four,” is made and seconded.
2. Currently, there is only one school resource officer that is divided between four campuses.
3. Another position will need to be added to the SCPD. Currently, there are not enough police officers.
4. That has already been addressed in a recommendation. It states to increase the police force by 10-20%.
5. The motion came from a comment addressing graduation in high school. SOAs are sufficient at gang abatement.
6. What does a school resource officer do?
7. School resource officers patrol the campus and attend after school activities. They act as abatement as well as beneficial, personal connections between youth and the police force.
8. Keep in mind if any more officers were to be added, SCCS would have to agree.
9. The motion carries unanimously.

XVI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 2.6

1. A motion to add a new recommendation with the language, “The City to collaborate with SCCS and COE to support and expand Adult Education with emphasis on GED and high school diploma programs,” is made and seconded.
2. The motion carries unanimously.

XVII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 29

1. A motion to amend recommendation 29 is made and seconded.

2. Remove the term “citizen” and replace it with “resident.” Also, include the term “networking” before outreach is recommended.
3. The motion carries unanimously.

XVIII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 39.1

1. A motion to add a new recommendation with the language, “Recommend City to coordinate with California State Parks (e.g. obtain a letter of trespass) to patrol Lighthouse Field during darkness hours to enforce illegal camping, drug use and sales, litter, pollution and other unsafe activities,” is made and seconded.
2. Currently there is no oversight.
3. The motion carries unanimously.

XIX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 26.1

1. A motion to add a new recommendation with the language, “Recommend the City conduct a ‘See something, say something’ campaign to engage the public in crime prevention,” is made and seconded.
2. This campaign is an effort to educate the public to help create a safer City by Reporting crimes or potential crimes.
3. Was this already addressed by a previous recommendation?
4. There were recommendations for mobile applications. There were specific recommendations, yet no comprehensive overall programs.
5. Does this recommendation fit as an example of another recommendation that has already been done?
6. The application recommendation addressed means for people to easily report crime, where this encourages people to report crime.
7. There is a program at the Boardwalk like this that has been very effective. Disneyland and San José Airport are two other examples that utilize this campaign.
8. Consider a friendly amendment with the language “community outreach” after the term “conduct” and strike the word “a.”
9. The friendly amendment is accepted.
10. The motion carries unanimously.

XX. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 64.1

1. A motion to add a new recommendation with the language, “Comprehensive strategy to make judicial elections competitive, including 1) information on judges records; 2) community efforts to get people to run against judges; 3) if all else fails, use recalls as mechanism to create competitive race,” is made and seconded.
2. The intent is to make judicial elections more competitive.
3. Recommendation 64 already addresses this. Part of it is being repeated in 64.1. Consider deleting the section about the recall. Also, this recommendation seems to contain no new material.
4. The community effort to get individuals to run against judges is a new component.
5. What categorical bucket would this fall under?
6. This would fall into criminal justice/accountability.
7. If the third section is a serious issue, it can be removed.
8. The recommendation extends beyond the City Council. It is difficult to imagine the Council accepting this recommendation.
9. This is something that needs to be done.
10. A concern regarding sending this on to the City Council is expressed.

11. Strike the third section and include the language “for example” before “1).”
12. This is not in line with the public safety recommendations, which seems covered in recommendation 64.
13. The motion fails.

XXI. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 52.1

1. A motion to add a new recommendation with the language, “City to explore a time limit (Ex. 4 hours of parking) within City owned parking lots along West Cliff and East Cliff Drives during daylight hours. Enforcement recommended by City parking control by marking tires and issuing parking tickets. This discourages vans and RVs from parking all day (day after day use) of the same parking spaces which denies the general public and the surfing community from the same use. Many of these larger RVs use two to three parking spaces and cause visual blight,” is made and seconded.
2. The language needs to be cleaned up.
3. The motion is tabled in order to clean up the language.

XXII. Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 10.1

1. A motion to add a new recommendation with the language, “Improve lighting on San Lorenzo River Levee, San Lorenzo Park and Harvey West area, to discourage illegal behavior, and reinvigorate public spaces,” is made and seconded.
2. This is all part of the CPTED strategy. It is part of the whole package of the CPTED recommendation.
3. It should still be separate.
4. The motion carries unanimously.

XXIII. Return to Discussion, Deliberation and the Legislative Phase for Recommendation 52.1

1. A motion is made to amend recommendation 52.1 by removing all of the language after “...issuing parking tickets.”
2. A friendly amendment is made to change the language, “City to implement a time limit...” which will replace “City to explore a time limit...”
3. Consider removing the last sentence also.
4. This sentence seems important. It is a way of keeping the turnover going.
5. A friendly amendment is made to consider the language “...parking and parking lots...”
6. This is accepted.
7. The motion carries unanimously.
8. There are no further motions to recommendations.

XXIV. Overview of the Recommendation Prioritization Phase

1. There was a memo sent to the TF members regarding the City Council directives.
2. The entire document has been combed through. Tonight’s edition of the report is the sixth edition.
3. Review items one through four in order to help the TF in deliberations regarding prioritizing. This would better provide an on point message that meets the expectations of the City on the subject matter and content of the report.
4. From here, what does the prioritization phase entail?
5. The TF works through the thought process and quickly establish priorities based on voting. There will be several priorities that will surface during this process. Then the TF will observe these priorities to try and delineate what the message is. Also, the TF will need to decide what happens with the rest of the recommendations that have not been identified as priorities.

6. Is the TF's intention to agree on everything so far?
7. Not necessarily, the TF should prioritize and then categorize based on length of solution.
8. How will feedback be received on the report?
9. Hopefully it will be given in writing.
10. The recording of the proceedings up until the deliberative phase is available in front of the TF. The report will be comprised of an executive summary, which summarizes this as well as the recommendations. There will be three sections of the report.
11. Will there be time tomorrow to talk about the report?
12. Yes, depending on how quickly this phase goes.
13. There was never any intention to agree on everything within each recommendation. There will be two forms of narratives.
14. The report should be the history of the TF's work. If there are any necessary changes, they should be sent in writing.
15. Tomorrow is intended to focus on the narrative that goes with the recommendations.
16. The written words that go with the recommendations need to be addressed tomorrow.
17. If there are sustentative comments, be prepared to deliver those tomorrow.
18. Should TF members agree with a whole section if they do? How should the support or approval process work?
19. If the TF gets too involved in massaging language the TF will get bogged down. It might be difficult to process the comments by tomorrow.
20. There are some opinionative comments in the report that potentially should not be included in the report. The community has not voted on these topics, and therefore these claims are more assumptions than data driven. There are some editorial comments that need to be cleaned up.
21. All the TF members should email their comments to staff regarding edits. Then staff will work towards reconciling those edits with an attempt to make them as historical as possible.
22. In regards to the actual prioritization phase, TF members will place color-coded stickers on the recommendations, which have been posted around the room, to easily visualize the TF's priorities. There are half as many stickers as there are recommendations. Stickers are color coded according to the recommendations' category.

XXV. Results of the Prioritization Phase

1. Recommendation 1 received 21 votes.
2. Recommendation 2.1 received six votes.
3. Recommendation 2.3 received two votes.
4. Recommendation four received two votes.
5. Recommendation five received 15 votes.
6. Recommendation nine received two votes.
7. Recommendation ten received 17 votes.
8. Recommendation 21 received two votes.
9. Recommendation 22 received five votes.
10. Recommendation 24 received one vote.
11. Recommendation 14 received 24 votes.
12. Recommendation 14.2 received 20 votes.
13. Recommendation 26 received five votes.
14. Recommendation 27 received eight votes.

15. Recommendation 29 received eight votes.
16. Recommendation 30 received seven votes.
17. Recommendation 32 received 16 votes.
18. Recommendation 33 received seven votes.
19. Recommendation 34 received 19 votes.
20. Recommendation 38 received eight votes.
21. Recommendation 41 received eight votes.
22. Recommendation 46 received 20 votes.
23. Recommendation 48 received four votes.
24. Recommendation 49.1 received four votes.
25. Recommendation 49.2 received 13 votes.
26. Recommendation 50 received 14 votes.
27. Recommendation 52 received seven votes.
28. Recommendation 53 received one vote.
29. Recommendation 54 received 17 votes.
30. Recommendation 50.1 received five votes.
31. Recommendation 54.1 received four votes.
32. Recommendation 56 received six votes.
33. Recommendation 57.1 received seven votes.
34. Recommendation 57 received six votes.
35. Recommendation 60 received six votes.
36. Recommendation 62 received 15 votes.
37. Recommendation 64 received one vote.
38. Recommendation 65.3 received four votes.
39. Recommendation 65 received 13 votes.
40. Recommendation 65.1 received six votes.
41. Recommendation 66 received 15 votes.
42. Recommendation 70 received six votes.
43. Recommendation 72 received five votes.
44. Recommendation 75 received five votes.
45. Recommendation 76 received 12 votes.
46. Recommendation 77 received eight votes.
47. Recommendation 79 received 12 votes.

XXVI. Discussion Regarding the Results of the Prioritization Phase

1. The threshold is 12 votes.
2. Consider the TF decide if these are the top priorities. Are there any recommendations that should be added?
3. That seems unnecessary. What the TF just did is basically prioritize the recommendations.
4. 19 out of 50 (or so) recommendations have been labeled as priorities.
5. Whatever recommendations did not make it as priorities will still be included in the report, however, they will be located in the appendix or somewhere near the back of the report.
6. Are 19 recommendations too many?
7. Are we watering down the importance of any of these recommendations with there being so many?
8. Considering the circumstances, 19 recommendations seem very reasonable.
9. A recommendation got overlooked; there are now a total of 20 priorities.
10. The top 20 recommendations are adopted unanimously.

11. The TF tomorrow will return and address the narrative part of the recommendation. It will be approached just as the TF has done with the recommendations.
12. On the 20th, the TF will return to accept or deny the document in its whole.
13. Any recommendation that received under five votes will be labeled as a low priority. Recommendations that received between five and ten votes will be labeled as medium priorities. Recommendations that received above the threshold will be labeled as a high priority.

Adjournment -- The Public Safety Citizen Task Force adjourned from the public meeting of November 12, 2013 at 10:05 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for November 3, 2013, 5:00 p.m., Santa Cruz Police Department, Community Room.

The City of Santa Cruz does not discriminate against persons with disabilities. Out of consideration for people with chemical sensitivities, we ask that you attend fragrance free. Upon request, the agenda can be provided in a format to accommodate special needs. Additionally, if you wish to attend this public meeting and will require assistance such as an interpreter for American Sign Language, Spanish, or other special equipment, please call the City Clerk's Department at 420-5030 in advance so that we can arrange for such special assistance. The Cal-Relay system number: 1-800-735-2922.

Public Safety Task Force meetings will be recorded for the purpose of preparing minutes.